

# GENERAL ASSEMBLY

## SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records



383rd  
PLENARY MEETING

Saturday, 18 October 1952, at 10.30 a.m.

Headquarters, New York

### CONTENTS

	Page
General debate ( <i>continued</i> ) .....	87

Speeches by Mr. Trujillo (Ecuador), Mr. Vyshinsky (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. Ocampos (Paraguay) and Mr. Guizado (Panama)

**President: Mr. Lester B. PEARSON (Canada).**

### General debate (*continued*)

[Agenda item 8]

SPEECHES BY MR. TRUJILLO (ECUADOR), MR. VYSHINSKY (UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS), MR. OCAMPOS (PARAGUAY) AND MR. GUIZADO (PANAMA)

1. Mr. TRUJILLO (Ecuador) (*translated from Spanish*): The annual session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, convened in keeping with Article 20 of the Charter, satisfies the democratic aspirations of all its Members, and by providing an opportunity for a debate which acquaints the world with the problems on whose solution the maintenance of peace depends, it compels States to follow, or to give the semblance of following, a policy conforming to the purposes and principles on which our Organization is based. Opposition by some, defence by others, and criticism from many quarters, provide the necessary material for a thorough understanding of the present international situation.

2. From this high rostrum speak the great and the small, those who have interests and positions which they are anxious to preserve or to expand both inside and outside their frontiers, and those of more modest station who have no ambition but to live in freedom and dignity. The men who speak for their States are not all of the same human stature: those who speak for a powerful country are mounted on a pedestal which multiplies their capacity and their influence a hundredfold: they are like giants. Those who speak for the medium or small countries have virtually no pedestal and are hardly seen or heard. Nevertheless, this rostrum has the virtue, whatever the State represented, of amplifying the vibrations of the words spoken from it so that they spread to the farthest horizons; when speaking from this place, we all feel ourselves to be equal, and through this wonderful achievement of the spirit we can cherish the hope that one day, although there is as yet no positive sign of it, the States will represent, not arbitrary desires and forces unchecked by reason, but legal institutions which

surrender part of their sovereignty for the sake of order and security. That is the salient and attractive feature of this world parliament which was born with the League of Nations at Geneva and which, with the United Nations, is slowly growing in prestige, so much so that statesmen keep back their governments' most important declarations and most decisive and far-reaching statements until they can announce them from this rostrum and so speak to all five continents.

3. If the General Assembly did nothing more than bring together many countries to hear and listen to each other, that in itself would be a magnificent achievement, for in this way the ground is broken for the sowing of the seeds of tolerance and respect for different forms of civilization, and these seeds may bring forth much sweeter fruit than is yielded by the cold, hard ground of purely diplomatic relations. This general debate, moreover, is some remedy for our need to make a constant revision in the programme we imposed upon ourselves at San Francisco, when, desperate with grief after unspeakable tragedy, we went so far as to sacrifice our equality by accepting the veto. This survey allows us to measure the progress we are making along the difficult path of interdependence which has replaced the anarchical freedom of States.

4. In the debate now proceeding, eloquent speeches have already been delivered describing, in impressive detail, the advances made in the study of the economic and social factors which have so large an influence on the development of peoples; we have been told how we may, in the light of information collected after long study, deduce conclusions previously unknown to us which we could not have reached without the combined efforts of men and resources which far excel any possible effort in isolation.

5. In the impressive procession of speakers which have so far occupied this rostrum, our attention was drawn to the intelligent and detailed memorandum of grievances read by the representative of Sweden [379 meeting], calling upon the Government of its

great neighbour to fulfil the obligation of all States to submit any disputes that may arise between them to an international tribunal. That neighbouring State would thus prove that its desire for peace, repeatedly proclaimed at many congresses and in political programmes, is real and not a mere propaganda trick, as might be suspected from its obstinate refusal to comply with the request of Sweden, a democracy that might serve as an example to many countries which pride themselves on greater military, economic and social resources. Like Sweden, other States have voiced their complaints in eloquent speeches, and many of them charge the Organization with being ineffective because it has not succeeded in finding satisfactory solutions for the problems brought before it. All the speakers we have heard so far have analysed from different points of view the most serious topics engaging the Assembly's attention, and all of them have agreed in attaching the utmost importance to the economic problem, to such a point that it is generally admitted that the future of mankind depends upon its timely and adequate solution.

6. My delegation associates itself with those which have analysed the world situation without optimism but with full confidence in the United Nations as a "centre for harmonizing the actions" undertaken by States to carry out the gigantic task of saving our generation from the scourge of war and the grip of poverty, disease and ignorance. It is fully confident that the Organization will create the conditions that make individual and collective life worth living. For this purpose, it is essential that all States should be willing to comply faithfully with the letter and spirit of the Charter they signed at San Francisco or acceded to later. Ecuador has complied with the Charter and is prepared to do so without reservations, regardless of the sacrifices involved.

7. My country has been sorely tried in the last few years, and while these ordeals might justify some scepticism regarding the value of legal principles, they have not succeeded in destroying its strong conviction that sooner or later these oft-violated principles will triumph and the rule of justice will be re-established, not only in the Americas but throughout the world. If the Powers which are little used to subordinating their ambitions to the rule of law are to accept the peaceful solutions offered by international organization and international justice, we shall need long and untiring propaganda work to win the support of the peoples, who will impose their views on their governments.

8. The establishment of international courts of justice, with compulsory jurisdiction over all problems without exception, will be the only way of preventing the misuse of force and the recurrence of injustices which weaken international understanding and threaten to destroy the basis of the United Nations.

9. We had special pleasure in listening to the representatives of Chile, New Zealand and Argentina; the first showed with unanswerable logic how the profound revolution which has taken place throughout the world must be met with valour and intelligence; and the others contended that steps must be taken for the substantial revision of our Charter, since past experience has shown that this instrument on which the United Nations is based must be improved.

10. A special committee of jurists should be appointed this year and given time and means enough to prepare a suitable draft for circulation to all governments. Then, after it has been fully discussed in each country, the committee can receive the considered suggestions of the parties concerned. After the comments of all the Ministries of Foreign Affairs have been received, the General Assembly can place on the agenda of its tenth session a proposal for the calling of a General Conference of the Members of the United Nations in order to review the Charter, in accordance with the provisions of Article 109, paragraph 3, of the Charter itself.

11. My delegation considers that the Statute of the International Court of Justice should also be amended. It does not wish to specify now in what respects the Statute might be amended so as to adapt it to new trends of legal thought and to the development of regional systems, which merit special consideration; even at this stage, however, I should like to mention the need to create a new organic system of international justice which will better reflect the various forms of legal thought in the world. The great services already rendered by the International Court of Justice could be increased if its Statute were to empower it to organize itself into permanent Regional Chambers where the most important languages spoken in the respective regions would be accepted as the working languages. In the exposition and defence of the law, the languages of the States which submit legal problems are of enormous importance. It is equally important that our Continent should possess a regional court of justice, closely connected with the Organization of American States, but at the same time part of the Court of The Hague, lest the harmony which should prevail in the sphere of law be destroyed. These are simply ideas which can be referred to the special technical committee which the Assembly should appoint this year to study the delicate and complex problem I have just outlined and to submit a report showing the need to convene another conference of Members of the United Nations to amend the Statute of the Court, by methods identical with those employed for reviewing the Charter.

12. The two basic instruments of the world Organization can be amended normally by following the rules laid down in the Charter. But all our work in this direction can be arrested by the veto. If, by any misfortune, such a serious and far-reaching event were to occur, I believe that the democratic world could not remain indifferent and agree to go on being subject to the tyranny of the veto, which has been denounced by most statesmen and by world public opinion. We could not allow the progress of the Organization to be halted or to continue our subservience to rules rendered obsolete by irresistible progress. We are sure that the States which have the power to block the evolution of the United Nations by vetoing any revision will then show themselves truly worthy of the confidence placed in them by the group of States which, at San Francisco, vested in them the anti-democratic right to outweigh with a single vote the wishes of all the peoples of the world. If such difficulties should arise, a suitable procedure would have to be devised for overcoming the obstacle, once all reasonable means had been exhausted of preventing the loss of legal unity which was a great triumph

achieved by the Charter, and the perpetuation of the division of the world into two hostile camps, one of which would undoubtedly be subject solely to the arbitrary rule of the strongest. If this were to happen, the uneasy peace under which we have suffered since the incompatibility of the democratic and communist States became apparent would last very little longer. But we should have to go on without hesitation to rebuild the United Nations, which cannot be allowed to disappear if order and security are to reign in the world. The revised Charter, or, if necessary, the new Charter, must be in harmony with the new social, political and economic trends.

13. My delegation has specific instructions on the subject of the serious and delicate colonial problem, in particular with relation to Tunis and Morocco. Ecuador shook off the colonial yoke after a long and bloody struggle and, since it had taken the lead in the struggle in the last century, suffered the direst consequences; it therefore has a sacred duty towards countries which are going through the same process as it did before it achieved emancipation, which long to win their freedom and have prepared themselves to fulfil the arduous duties which the exercise of sovereignty imposes on a modern State. My Government and the people of Ecuador ally themselves with and enthusiastically support all countries which are struggling to rid themselves of colonial exploitation, to break the bonds which bind them to the fate of other countries against their will and to their misfortune. Unfortunately, this great movement of independence which is stirring among the peoples which are subject to a colonial system, under whatever name, is being strongly influenced from outside by political agents who exploit the simplicity and ignorance of the masses to lead them, under the banner of freedom, into another slavery, much harsher than that from which they wish to escape. The peoples who wish to break the bonds of colonialism and to arise as independent States are being skilfully exploited; those who support them and, in some cases, their leaders, nourish the evil design of subjecting them to a worse servitude.

14. The criticism directed against the colonial régime of some States is, of course, justified. It should not be forgotten, however, that France recognizes and respects human dignity in the territories under its sovereignty, and that it has worked and is working hard, with all the resources at its command, to prepare the inhabitants of those territories to manage the independent régime which it is proposed to set up. France is handing on its culture through schools, universities and technical institutes which are turning out men distinguished in every branch of human knowledge, to whom it will eventually be possible to delegate the responsibility of leading their fellow citizens. France has transformed villages in those territories into cities which enjoy all the facilities of the richest urban centres of Europe or America; it has worked their mines and cultivated their fields by scientific processes which have transformed them into veritable centres of wealth that will serve to give these countries a high economic and social level, so that they will not fall into the hands of those who are anxious to separate them from France or subject them to a despotism which sacrifices individuality to the State. France cannot break with its noble legal

tradition; France cannot forget that it is the cradle of the ideas and principles which have produced our civilization. We must have faith in this great democracy and give it an opportunity to find for itself, through free and open discussion with the peoples under its leadership, a formula which will reconcile conflicting interests and allow for the birth of two or more new democracies which may join the ranks of the free peoples and co-operate with us in the common task of building a better world. The United Nations should be the place in which the problem of these countries' independence can be discussed, without intervening directly in the argument. It can lend all its co-operation, and help them to achieve the aim which we all desire. The United Nations cannot impose any solution at this stage of the negotiations. Later, if it is so requested by one of the parties, or if peace is threatened, it can proceed to act in accordance with the terms of the Charter.

15. The profound and delicate political understanding of France encourages me to think that it has already realized the position in which the historical circumstances of the century have placed it and that it will not remain deaf to the demands of reason and justice. It will solve this temporary difficulty in accordance with the aspirations of the peoples and will recognize, with its noble and traditional courtesy, that the colonial régime is impossible in sufficiently developed territories and that such countries are entitled to manage their own affairs. France, the mother of freedom, must heed the call for freedom if it is to remain faithful to its own most splendid traditions.

16. The best weapons with which to defend our ideals are not to be found in the arsenals of war. All the armies in the world are not enough to resist the force of ideas, whenever these ideas are the interpreters of natural and human realities. I believe that our greatest weakness in this cold war between the western and the communist Powers, which is gradually breaking down all moral principles, is that we have spent more money on the rearmament programme than on social and economic assistance to the under-trained and under-developed countries. The little sum that has been allocated to those countries for that purpose has only been enough to show them how much they need and, instead of producing a feeling of gratitude, has created an undercurrent of passive resistance and ill-will which is waiting for a favourable moment to declare itself, skilfully exploited by the common enemy. This enemy has given them nothing, but it offers them a paradise which, beautiful, distant and unknown, serves admirably to attract unsuspecting innocents. It is interesting to see, in that connexion, that a service inadequately rendered engenders no more gratitude than does a service rendered clumsily or discourteously.

17. A large increase in economic and social assistance to all countries which need it is a matter of immediate urgency. If millions of dollars have been spent unhesitatingly on the monstrous programme of armament which is regarded as necessary to hold back aggression, it is essential that we should be bold enough to set aside the same amount for moral rearmament, the education of millions of ignorant men, the feeding of hungry peoples, the restoration of health to regions which are sources of suffering and disease, for public



works, electrification, housing, transport, etc., as was so brilliantly expressed by Mr. Santa Cruz, when he made his moving plea [379th meeting] for the conquest of that universal revolution which threatens, like a hurricane, to destroy all that was so patiently won by our ancestors, and developed by us without a genuine and fitting understanding of social justice.

18. The technical development of Latin America is of special interest by reason of the vast natural resources which are still unexploited. To be fair, we must recognize that special attention has been paid to this regional problem and that the Deputy Director-General of the office of the United Nations Technical Assistance Administration has spared no effort to satisfy the requests constantly made by our governments, which he has answered in a way which deserves our deep gratitude.

19. Previously, my country suffered from the disastrous visitation of certain very highly paid technicians who came to study subjects in which we had little or no interest, or for which they were not prepared, or who failed because they were incapable of understanding either our language or the social environment in which they were working. This background made for a certain lack of confidence in the usefulness of technical co-operation, and this mistrust my Government is trying to dispel. The present position is different, and we cannot but express our gratitude towards those experts with open and understanding minds, such as the distinguished Latin-American officials to whom I referred earlier, who have sent men of real capacity to study our budgetary, financial and administrative problems and to work as a team with national personnel whom they are training to continue the programme which they planned and started.

20. If Ecuador receives economic assistance for modernizing its ports, completing certain highways and putting into effect a large-scale plan of electrification, it will be able to increase its food production and thus help to alleviate the crisis of which we are all well aware.

21. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization is waging a vast campaign for the purpose of transforming mankind. The mentality which is incapable of adapting itself to new social conditions and the most recent technical inventions is doomed. It is regrettable but true that most schools and colleges in Latin America still follow antiquated programmes and are not carrying out their important task of training men capable of dealing with the complexity and mutability of the modern world. The instrument with which we are equipped to guide them, though wonderful in itself, lacks the elements which circumstances require. The task assumed by UNESCO is so delicate and difficult that it has had to begin by revising its own methods, revolutionizing systems and laying the foundations for a life which demands a new style of thought and action. We must, however, congratulate ourselves on the results that UNESCO is achieving in many countries and we cherish the hope that governments will lend it greater support so that its beneficent influence may continue to increase, for it is an influence which elevates minds, cleanses hearts and gives new force to the will.

22. I should like, Mr. President, to offer my sincerest wishes for the success of this session of the

Assembly, the conduct of whose business has been so auspiciously placed in your hands. It is to be hoped that all the representatives will co-operate in a speedy solution of the problems on our agenda and that their moderation, their intelligence and their noble spirit of tolerance will help to create a favourable climate in which this uncertain peace of ours may grow in strength, and the clouds which threaten to cover the earth in darkness lift and disappear.

23. Mr. VYSHINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): As the seventh session of the General Assembly takes up its work, important and complex questions of vital concern to millions of human beings, of whole peoples and States, are in the foreground of international attention. The most crucial of these problems in that of peace, of peaceful co-operation and international security. These problems also played an important part in the work of previous sessions of the General Assembly, at which the Soviet Union delegation consistently and perseveringly upheld the need for the adoption by the General Assembly of measures for the maintenance of peace and the strengthening of co-operation among nations. The present session of the General Assembly has met at a time when problems of international relations call for particular attention as a result of the complications and tensions of the present international situation.

24. The year that has elapsed since the sixth session of the General Assembly has shown that the activities of the North Atlantic bloc—whose aggressive aims its organizers and leaders are vainly seeking to conceal by references to the alleged need for defensive measures—have played and are continuing to play a decisive role in the heightening of international tension and in the deterioration of the international situation. The leaders of that bloc, who come from the ruling circles of the United States, and from those of the United Kingdom and France, which support United States policy, are making demagogic speeches about peace and behind this peace-loving façade are continuing to foment a war psychosis and exerting every effort to maintain the tension in their own countries and to prevent the peaceful settlement of important questions of foreign policy which are still outstanding and whose immediate solution is demanded by all peace-loving peoples.

25. Any account of the contemporary international situation would be incomplete without a reference to the further deterioration in the economic and political situation of the so-called under-developed countries, where, in spite of great natural resources, hundreds of millions of people are doomed to a life of poverty and hunger and death from starvation.

26. Even the report of the United Nations Secretariat on the current year's work cannot conceal this. It shows that political, economic and social problems are particularly acute in Asia, the Middle East, North Africa and Latin America; the author of the report is compelled to admit that the national liberation movement of peoples claiming equal rights and freedom from foreign control is growing in those countries.

27. Not concealing his hostility to this movement, which has in fact spread to countries comprising a population of more than a thousand million people

who are seeking to break the chains of foreign domination, the author of the report proclaims that this movement represents "one of the greatest challenges to contemporary civilization"<sup>1</sup> and calls upon the General Assembly to find ways—I quote the words of the report—to prevent "the violent upheavals and widespread chaos"<sup>2</sup> which, according to the author, would otherwise probably be in store for the United Nations Organization.

28. In his statement the day before yesterday [380th meeting], the United States Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, also referred to the situation of the colonial peoples and dependent countries. But he too was compelled to admit that the plight of the peoples of those countries was tragic. "The tragedy", Mr. Acheson said, "is that over half the world's people still suffer from malnutrition and many live on the verge of starvation". He went on to say that "the world today has less food per person than it did before the Second World War". Mr. Acheson explains this situation in which, as he says, half the population of the globe is deprived of the means of existence, by the fact that there is not enough food to go round and that, in many areas of the world, food output is increasing at a slower rate than is population. I think there is no need to dwell on the worthlessness of this Malthusian explanation, particularly as Mr. Acheson is, I am sure, fully aware of the real causes of the tragedy to which he referred. The situation in these countries is in fact the direct result of their predatory exploitation, predominantly, at the present time, by American monopolistic capital, which does not spare the so-called under-developed countries of the East, of Latin America or of Asia, or even a number of the capitalist countries of Europe which have already attained a considerable degree of economic development.

29. All this cannot fail to heighten the international tension and this is particularly true of the military operations which the bloc of colonial Powers is waging in the East against the peoples of Korea, Vietnam and Malaya, who are fighting for their independence and freedom.

30. The war in Korea is already in its third year. It is quite obvious that the aggressive plans of the United States with respect to Korea have failed, despite the fact that the United States Command, in order to break the resistance of the Korean people, has not hesitated and is not hesitating to use beastly and barbarous methods of warfare, to destroy Korean cities and to exterminate the civilian population, not sparing women, children or the aged. Flouting all the standards of international law and disregarding the elementary requirements of morality, the United States forces are introducing and systematically using gases, napalm bombs and bacterial weapons.

31. The failure of the United States intervention, however, has not caused the United States ruling circles to desist from further attempts to carry out their aggressive plans. In his statement of the day before yesterday, Mr. Acheson again attempted to represent United States intervention in Korea as a

United Nations struggle against aggression, repeating the completely discredited theory that the war which the United States interventionists have inflicted upon the Korean people is defensive in character and is not being waged for aggressive purposes, whereas, of course, it is just the opposite that is true.

32. Asked how long the war in Korea would continue, Mr. Acheson replied: "We shall fight on as long as is necessary to stop the aggression and to restore peace and security to Korea".

33. In the report which has been circulated by the Secretariat to delegations at the present session, Mr. Trygve Lie urges the continuation of intervention in Korea and calls upon the United Nations to continue the war in Korea and to demonstrate its determination to act energetically. This illustrates the truth of the Russian proverb: "Where the horse goes with his hooves, the crab goes with its claws".

34. Mr. Acheson told the General Assembly that the United States would stop fighting in Korea when an armistice had been reached "on just terms". But why did he fail to indicate what constitutes "just terms"? Perhaps he will still find time to explain to the General Assembly what he means by "just terms"? None of the terms hitherto put forward by the United States Command in Korea, of course with the approval of the United States Government, can be described as being in any way fair. They can only be described as being in flagrant violation of the basic concept of fairness, as patently illegal and contrary to all the generally recognized rules of international law and international morality. This applies to the United States demand for the so-called "screening" of prisoners of war, that is, the division of the prisoners into those whom the United States Command is prepared to repatriate, and those whom it intends to retain in captivity. The United States Command does not recoil from using any method of compulsion to achieve its ends, including shooting, as was the case on Koje Island and in other American camps for Chinese and Korean prisoners of war.

35. In this connexion, certain facts connected with the action taken by the sixth session of the General Assembly in the Korean question inevitably spring to mind. The United States representative stated then, as now, that the United States Government would exert every effort to secure an armistice in Korea on lasting terms acceptable to both parties. Opposing the Soviet Union delegation's proposal that the General Assembly should discuss the question of an armistice in Korea and should facilitate the attainment of positive results by the parties concerned, the United States representative stated last year that that proposal was premature and could only serve to impede the conclusion of an armistice in Korea, and that a lasting political agreement must be based on "secure and sound foundations"<sup>3</sup> which might be laid by the successful conclusion of armistice negotiations.

36. The USSR delegation pointed out at the time that this was merely a pretext designed to prolong the negotiations by making absurd demands on the Korean Army and the Chinese volunteers concerning

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Seventh Session, Supplement No. 1A*, p. 2.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, Sixth Session, First Committee, 507th meeting, para. 46.

the construction and reconstruction of airfields and the exchange of prisoners of war, while employing intimidation, blackmail and pressure in the form of military action. We pointed out at that time that the United States Command was using such methods in the attempt to secure concessions and to prolong the negotiations, while increasing its military equipment and reserves in preparation for further aggression.

37. Nearly a year has since elapsed. Are we not now fully justified in contending that all the events of that year, the whole course of the Panmunjom armistice talks, have fully confirmed the fears that we expressed last year? The United States negotiators have prolonged the talks without cause. At the same time, the United States Air Force has been bombing the Korean rear, destroying cities, burning villages and exterminating the Korean civilian population—defenceless children, women and old people—perpetrating one crime after another and violating all the generally recognized rules of international law and morality.

38. That is what the "secure and sound foundations", about which the United States representative spoke here so glibly, actually amount to. That is the true face of those honourable terms acceptable to both parties, of which the United States representative assured the Assembly in such high-flown terms.

39. Now we hear talk about "just terms". We no longer hear about honourable or acceptable terms, about "secure" and "sound" foundations. All this has been replaced by talk about some sort of just terms, designed simply to confuse the credulous. Such statements cannot be taken seriously, particularly in view of the record of the negotiations with the representatives of the United States Command in Korea during the past year.

40. It is obvious that the United States Government has no great desire for an armistice or an end to the Korean war. As before, it is trying to conceal its economic difficulties by waging that war. It has done everything in its power to drag out the Panmunjom truce talks and, recently, suspended negotiations *sine die*, hoping thus to be able to exert pressure on the other side.

41. The latest communication from the Commander-in-Chief of the Korean People's Army, General Kim Il Sung, and the Commander-in-Chief of the Chinese People's Volunteers, General Peng Teh Huai, to General Mark Clark, rightly pointed out that, had it not been for the United States Command's deliberate obstruction of the settlement of the prisoner-of-war issue, an armistice in Korea would, without any doubt, have been achieved long ago. Peace would assuredly have been restored in South and North Korea, and the prisoners of war of both sides would have returned home long since to civil life.

42. This obstruction, however, has served its purpose, having led to the recent breakdown in the negotiations, in spite of all Kim Il Sung and Peng Teh Huai's efforts to reach positive results. On 8 October, ten days ago, these generals submitted a proposal to that end, to which exception could be taken only by those who had resolved in advance to prevent an armistice in Korea at all costs.

43. What was that proposal? I shall take the liberty of reading parts of it:

"Considering that it is lawful to demand the repatriation of all prisoners of war of both sides and their return to peaceful pursuits, we proposed that, following the coming into force of the armistice agreement, all prisoners of war should be taken to mutually agreed exchange points in the demilitarized zone, as proposed by you"—that is, the United States Command—"so that they can be turned over to and accepted by the other side."

This is the first provision contained in the proposals submitted to General Clark by Kim Il Sung and Peng Teh Huai.

"After the prisoners of war have been turned over on both sides", the letter goes on to say, "mixed groups of the Red Cross shall visit them as provided in paragraph 57 of the draft armistice agreement on Korea and as proposed by you"—that is, again, the United States side; this is the second United States proposal agreed to by Kim Il Sung and Peng Teh Huai—"in order to explain that their return home, to peaceful pursuits, has been guaranteed, and that they are not to participate in military operations in Korea. Following this, a classification of prisoners of war shall be conducted according to their nationality and domicile, as proposed by us"—that is, Kim Il Sung and Peng Teh Huai, the Korean-Chinese side. "Repatriation shall take place immediately after the classification. The exchange, visit, classification and repatriation of prisoners of war can be conducted under the supervision of control groups composed of representatives of neutral countries."

44. What was the United States delegation's reaction to these really fair and reasonable conditions, to this proposal which, it would seem should have paved the way for the final settlement of the Korean situation? The United States delegation completely ignored the proposal. It refused to discuss it and immediately proceeded to read out its previously prepared statement concerning the suspension of negotiations *sine die*. The United States delegation then walked out of the conference room without even waiting to hear the Korean-Chinese Command's reply to its statement.

45. Mr. Acheson said nothing about this, here, when he spoke about the situation in Korea; he preferred to hide behind empty phrases about "just terms" although really just terms were submitted to the United States Command almost two weeks ago by Kim Il Sung and Peng Teh Huai, who have done everything in their power to secure an armistice agreement in Korea.

46. The American multi-millionaires, who are profiting by this war, are naturally reluctant to see it end. They are bent on continuing to use it as one of their main sources of enrichment and as one of the means of averting the threat of a depression and the growing crisis in the capitalist countries, above all in the United States. This is obvious from numerous statements by leading American businessmen, financiers, stockbrokers, politicians, generals, ministers and the President of the United States himself.

47. A prominent American financier, Mr. James Warburg, for example, publicly stated that the United States is rapidly acquiring a legitimate interest in the absence of peace. According to Mr. Warburg,



the war is saving the United States economy from depression and crisis by flooding the war industry with military orders mainly destined to prolong the Korean war.

48. When, in the spring of 1952, there was talk of the possibility of an armistice in Korea, the *Wall Street Journal* reported that prices on the stock exchange had shown a particularly sharp decline during the preceding period. This was ascribed to widespread rumours of peace . . . brokers feared that the cessation of hostilities might interfere with rearmament and leave leading firms with inflated capital investments disproportionate to the needs of peace-time production.

49. Not only the American, but also the British Press commented on this, as may be seen, for example, from the statement published in the well-known British weekly, *New Statesman and Nation*, to the effect that United States business circles can hardly be expected to welcome peace, since the United States economy is geared to war. It was further stated that the United States could not scrap its armaments and switch to civilian production, as it had in 1945.

50. The well-known United States Senator, Mr. Taft, is also urging delay in concluding an armistice in Korea, and is openly stressing the need to prolong the truce talks until war production in the United States has, as he puts it, reached its peak. The fact that the United States is already in the throes of a feverish armaments race is apparently not enough for Mr. Taft.

51. United States generals, for example, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Bradley, also favour a breakdown in the Korean talks for military reasons, namely, the need to gain time to carry out an even more extensive military programme involving further increases in armaments and armed forces and the construction of new military, naval and air bases outside the United States, and the expansion of existing ones.

52. The United States Secretary of the Army, Mr. Pace, has expressed himself in favour of the war and has expressed the view that the Korean war is helping the United States to test and perfect its military techniques and to improve its arms and ammunition.

53. The Commander of the United States Eighth Army in Korea, General Van Fleet, called the Korean war a blessing—that was the word he used; he was undeterred by the blasphemy—asserting that such military operations were essential either in Korea or in some other parts of the world.

54. In his statement on 27 September 1952, President Truman announced that he would not follow the advice of those who urged the withdrawal of United States armed forces from Korea. He said substantially the same thing in the statement which appears in the *New York Press* today, namely, that the United States would not permit the withdrawal of its forces from Korea. The statement of the President of the United States can of course be interpreted only as a decision by the United States ruling circles to continue this shameful war against the Korean people.

55. In the circumstances, it should be clear to everyone why the United States Command has suspended

the Panmunjom talks in spite of all the efforts of the Korean side to reach an agreement on an armistice on terms acceptable to all fair-minded people and based on the universally accepted rules of international law. It also becomes clear why the United States ruling circles are stubbornly rebuffing all attempts to reach agreement and are inventing a variety of pretexts for initiating fruitless discussion, for the sole purpose of delaying or disrupting the Korean truce talks, as indeed has just happened.

56. They use the question of the exchange of prisoners of war as a pretext of that kind, presenting unprecedented demands contrary to the most fundamental and universally accepted rules of international law. They have even committed a gross violation of the 1949 Geneva Convention, and in particular articles 118 and 119 of that Convention, which require belligerents to guarantee the unconditional repatriation of all prisoners of war, with the exception of those against whom criminal proceedings for an indictable offence are pending. The United States has refused to comply with this requirement, despite the fact that the United States Government is a signatory to the Convention.

57. As we have already pointed out, the United States has unlawfully, and by unscrupulously exerting every kind of pressure and coercion, carried out a screening of prisoners of war, extorting from them declarations of unwillingness to return to their homes. The protests of the Korean and Chinese prisoners of war against this arbitrary and illegal action have been silenced by the United States Command, as was in the case in the prisoner of war camps on Koje Island, by shootings, which still continue in American prisoner-of-war camps. This is a violation of international law unprecedented in history.

58. The present session of the General Assembly is again faced with the task of finding a settlement for the Korean question. The peace-loving peoples who have created a powerful front fighting for peace throughout the world, are demanding ever more insistently and urgently the cessation of the war in Korea and the curbing of the imperialist aggressors; and are offering ever-increasing resistance to United States aggressive policy. It is the General Assembly's duty to solve this problem and to do so in accordance with the principles of the United Nations.

59. The proposals submitted by the Polish delegation [A/2229] fully meet the General Assembly's requirements in this respect. The USSR delegation therefore wholeheartedly supports our Polish colleagues' proposal, which calls on the General Assembly to recommend to the belligerents the immediate cessation of military operations on land, at sea and in the air. It also wholeheartedly supports the proposal for the repatriation of all prisoners of war in accordance with international law. It warmly supports the Polish delegation's proposal for the withdrawal from Korea of foreign troops, including foreign volunteers—the Chinese volunteer units—within a period of two or three months, and the peaceful settlement of the Korean question on the principle of the unification of Korea, this unification to be achieved by the Koreans themselves under the supervision of a commission composed of representatives of the parties immediately concerned

and those of other States, which have not taken part in the war in Korea.

60. In the view of the Soviet Union delegation and Government, this is the way to settle the Korean question. This is also one of the most effective ways of removing the present tension in international relations, of preserving peace and strengthening international security.

61. The USSR delegation feels it necessary to call particular attention to the use of bacterial weapons by United States armed forces in Korea, a fact which, as we know, is obstinately denied by the United States Government.

62. Official representatives of the United States are endeavouring to deny that United States armed forces have used this inhuman weapon. But many facts have been established by impartial international committees, such as the committee of the International Association of Democratic Lawyers, and the International Scientific Commission composed of representatives of seven countries—the United Kingdom, Brazil, Italy, China, the USSR, France and Sweden, proving that the United States interventionists have committed these atrocious crimes. In its report, the commission of scientists, which represents seven nations, told the world that it was compelled to bow before the weight of the evidence and admit that such brutal methods were indeed being used, though they were condemned by the peoples of the whole world. It further stated that the peoples of Korea and China had been subjected to continuous bacterial attacks by United States armed forces, who used a variety of methods for infecting the populations, some of which appear to be a development of those used by the Japanese army during the Second World War. This was confirmed by the captured United States officers O'Neill, Enoch, Quinn and Niss, who had themselves taken part in air raids in which they used bombs filled with bacteria of the most dangerous infectious diseases, intended for the mass destruction of the peaceful population. In the five halls of the recently opened exhibition in Peking of material evidence of the use by United States armed forces of bacterial weapons, are to be found some 500 documents, photographs and other material. These are facts. They have been firmly established and cannot be shaken by demagoguery, by lies, by trickery or by slander.

63. While trying vainly to refute these facts, the United States Government nevertheless openly refuses to ratify the 1925 Geneva Protocol prohibiting the use of bacterial weapons which it signed, wishing apparently to remain free to use these weapons in future. An official representative of the United States, General Alden Waitt, Chief of the United States Chemical Warfare Service, is full of praise for bacterial weapons, which he describes as a practical form of warfare, with tremendous potentialities. He asserts that the United States has no right or, as he puts it, cannot afford, to ignore this weapon, particularly as it is both cheap and simple to use.

64. It is no accident that bacterial weapons attract so much attention in these circles, nor is it by accident that American universities—for example, the University of California—are doing special research on the dissemination of plague by means of spraying. Bacteria are regarded in the United States as a major

weapon of war. "Germs and not generals win wars!" These words were spoken the other day by General Creasy of the United States Army Chemical Corps. It is not generals—generals, please note—who win the wars, but the germs which replace the generals in the United States Army. Nor is it by accident that, particularly during this past year, a number of United States Government and scientific institutions have redoubled their efforts to improve methods of breeding bacteria. They are concentrating on selecting the most virulent types and on perfecting ways and means for their dissemination.

65. Bacterial weapons are used in Korea, however, not only for the criminal purpose of mass destruction of the peaceful population, but also to test the weapon in practice and to acquire experience, so to speak, in its use; to test, as the United States Secretary of the Army, Mr. Pace, openly stated, the efficacy of methods and processes used in solving pressing military problems. The American aggressors are thus trying to use Korea as a proving ground to try out the effectiveness of deadly bacteria. That is the nadir of moral turpitude.

66. The USSR delegation therefore considers it essential to place particular emphasis on the great significance of the Polish delegation's proposal, calling on all the States which have not yet acceded to or ratified the 1925 Geneva Protocol to do so. This applies in particular to the United States, which has so far refused to ratify the Geneva Protocol. The USSR delegation fully shares the indignation that the use of bacterial weapons against the Korean and Chinese peoples by United States armed forces has aroused in millions of decent human beings all over the world. The USSR delegation whole-heartedly supports the proposal submitted by the Polish delegation.

67. During the past year, the aggressive North Atlantic bloc has intensified its activities in preparation for a new world war. A frenzied armaments race is taking place in the countries which are members of that bloc. Great efforts are being made to organize new armies and to create aggressive military alliances in the west and in the east. During the year, largely owing to the efforts of the United States, two new countries—Turkey and Greece—have been brought into the North Atlantic bloc. In practice, Western Germany and Yugoslavia, vassals of the United States, are also members of that bloc.

68. During the year, the Western Powers, led by the United States, have signed a separate agreement at Bonn with the Adenauer Government; this agreement is an overt military alliance legalizing the renaissance of German militarism and the establishment of a West German mercenary army under the command of fascist and hitlerite generals. Subsequently, they signed another agreement with Western Germany, on the so-called European Defence Community, which has the same objectives.

69. The ruling circles in the United States have increased their pressure on the countries in the Near and Middle East to establish a so-called Middle East allied command and to induce these countries to join it, and in this way to join the North Atlantic bloc, so that they can use their territories, like those of other colonial and dependent countries, for the construction of military bases, and their populations as



reservoirs of manpower for the new world war which they are preparing. They allege that such a "Command" must be organized as a means of defence against the Soviet Union, which is said to be threatening the security of the countries of the Near and Middle East. Such pretexts, however, are all too flimsy; their absurdity should be quite obvious. Unlike the Powers which are accustomed to regard the countries of the Near and Middle East as their colonies, the policy of the Soviet Union towards those countries has been fully in keeping with the basic national interests of the peoples of the Near and Middle East and, indeed, of all peace-loving peoples.

70. During the past year; the ruling circles of the United States have imposed on a number of Latin-American countries—Brazil, Colombia and others—so-called agreements involving so-called mutual security guarantees. The true significance of these agreements was defined by even the bourgeois Latin-American Press in such headlines as: "Brazil mobilizes for War". Under the same pretext of "defence" of the United States—invented to receive people—the ruling circles of the United States have concluded a Pacific pact with New Zealand and Australia, declaring that these regions are of vital importance to the security of the United States, although it is well known that they are separated from the United States by several thousand miles.

71. Simultaneously, the North Atlantic bloc, under United States leadership, has been carrying out vast naval and air manoeuvres which are patently designed to provoke the USSR and the peoples' democracies, as was apparent, in particular, from the recent manoeuvres conducted by eight members of the North Atlantic bloc under the significant name of "Operation Main Brace".

72. The United States, which, it is well known, plays a leading part in this bloc, has been still further intensifying the armaments race, expanding war industries and developing other military measures on a grand scale.

73. The ruling military circles in the United States have paid particular attention to the construction of new military; naval and air bases overseas. Such newly constructed American bases as those in Canada, Greenland, Iceland, Norway, Denmark, the Azores, French Morocco, Tripolitania, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Transjordan, Japan and a number of other countries are directed—and this is openly proclaimed—against the USSR, the Chinese People's Republic and the European people's democracies. The construction of a large number of American bases in Western Europe should be noted. In the United Kingdom, for example, there are now twenty-six American air and other bases. The United Kingdom has already been virtually transformed into one vast American air base. As our President should know, at the Lisbon meeting of the North Atlantic bloc it was decided to establish a huge network of air bases, to be paid for mainly by the United States, in a number of Western European countries which are members of the bloc; as a result of this decision, approximately 200 military aerodromes are to be built in the near future.

74. Such are the facts. They show that in the imperialist camp the rate of preparation for a new world

war is being accelerated under the cover of lying propaganda to the effect that the USSR is threatening the peace.

75. Another convincing indication of the aggressive intentions of the North Atlantic bloc are the ever-increasing military credits voted in the countries which belong to the bloc, particularly in the United States. In the United States, military expenditure in the financial year 1952-1953, according to published data, was more than 58 times as much as in the financial year 1937-1938, and now constitutes 74 per cent of the total United States budget, compared to 14 per cent in 1937-1938. Vast appropriations are included in the United States budget for the production of atomic weapons and the expansion of the atomic energy industry, this "billion dollar business", as they say in the United States, from which American monopolists are reaping tremendous profits. It should be pointed out that the 1952 appropriation for the production of atomic weapons was twice as great as in 1951, and further increases are foreseen in the coming years.

76. It seems to me that all these facts are sufficiently convincing to show the hypocrisy of the oratory of the leading political personalities of the United States and the worthlessness of the various plans which they and their allies in the United Nations put forward for the alleged purpose of prohibiting atomic weapons and reducing armaments. It is thus no accident that the United States Government is making every effort to increase even further the production of atomic weapons. Whereas \$418 million were spent on the production of atomic weapons in 1945 and 1946—according to published data, which are certainly an understatement—\$897 million were spent in 1950-1951 and \$1,700 million in the current year 1952-1953. During the next two years, it is estimated that this expenditure will increase to \$3,000 million. These figures are sufficient, too, to show that the ruling circles of the United States are not thinking of reducing the production of atomic weapons, much less of prohibiting it, and that every statement by official United States representatives on their readiness to prohibit atomic weapons is absolutely false and solely directed at misleading naïve and over credulous persons.

77. The militarization of industry in the United States has increased still further during the last year. The growth of industrial production in the United States is accounted for exclusively by the sudden increase in military production resulting from the United States intervention in Korea, the intensified armaments drive, the construction of new American military air bases at the ends of the earth—particularly at points around the perimeter of the Soviet Union and the people's democracies—and the growth in numbers of United States armed forces. These data also emphasize the fact that the militarization of the United States economy is assuming tremendous proportions. General Eisenhower, too, was forced to admit this, among other things, in one of his speeches, when he said that the economy of the United States was a military economy, that its development was a military development. The more sober sections of the American Press, speaking of the unprecedented growth of militarism in the United States, point out that if this all-pervading militarism is compared with the defen-

sive measures adopted by the United States in 1941, it is easy to see that, as one member of the House of Representatives—Mr. Buffet of Nebraska—stated, the United States had advanced much further towards war than it had in 1941.

78. The same militarization of industry can be seen in the United Kingdom, where military expenditure in the financial year 1952-1953 amounts to approximately 34 per cent of the total budget, or more than twice the military expenditure in the pre-war period.

79. In France, military expenditure in 1952 amounts to 3,789 thousand million francs, as against 92,700 million francs in 1938. France is now spending considerably more on war preparations than it spent in 1938, the last pre-war year. Taking 21 francs in 1950 as equivalent to 1 franc in 1938, in accordance with the ratio established in France, the French military budget in 1950 was 82 per cent of the military budget for 1938 (500,000 million francs as against 611,000 million francs at the 1950 rate). The official military appropriations for 1952 exceed pre-war levels and are now 145 per cent of the figure for 1938, and nearly 40 per cent of the entire French budget.

80. We are therefore justified in speaking of the rapid rate of militarization of the economies of the United States, the United Kingdom, France and the other capitalist countries. It can be explained by the characteristics of contemporary monopolistic capitalism, which is motivated solely by the desire to derive maximum profits. This desire drives it—as I. V. Stalin proved in his remarkable work, recently published. “The economic problems of socialism in the USSR”—“to such hazardous measures as enslaving and systematically plundering the colonies and other backward countries, transforming a number of independent countries into dependent countries, organizing new wars which, for the leaders of contemporary capitalism, are the best form of ‘business’, yielding the highest profits, and, finally, attempting to attain world economic domination”. It is well known that the military fever in the United States is resulting in huge profits for American multi-millionaires. In 1951, these profits amounted to almost \$43,000 million, or 13 times more than in 1938. The same thing can be seen, though on a smaller scale, in the United Kingdom and France.

81. It is quite understandable, in the light of such facts, that the President of the United States, Mr. Truman, is asking for ever greater appropriations to carry out the military programme and, in particular, for the construction of military bases, and that he opposes any reduction of such appropriations on the grounds that it would be, as he put it, a dreadful catastrophe to reduce these appropriations and thus with one stroke of the pen to lose half the bases concerned.

82. This shows that the foreign policy of the United States Government is dependent on the interests of the magnates of industry and finance in the United States, who are thirsting for a new war so that they can earn millions of dollars from this sanguinary enterprise and who do not even think of relinquishing their military programme or the armaments drive. Not long ago, the *New York Post* stated that the slightest whisper of a disarmament agreement was enough to alarm business men, bankers and politicians throughout the country.

83. The militarization of the entire economy of the United States, the United Kingdom, France, and a number of other countries in the North Atlantic bloc, combined with the tremendous increase in military expenditure, inevitably leads to endless increases in taxation and in the burdens of taxation imposed on the population, to lower standards of living for millions of people, and to a reduction in the credits designed to satisfy the elementary requirements of the masses of the people. In the United States, direct taxation in the financial year 1952-1953 is more than twelve times as high as in 1937-1938. Taxes have also increased considerably in the United Kingdom, France, Italy and other capitalist countries which are members of the North Atlantic bloc. Mr. Symington, former Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, has said that out of every dollar of tax, 60 cents go to the Pentagon, that is to say, are used for military purposes.

84. In these countries, there is a growth of unemployment which cannot be concealed even by the official economic reports and reviews, as is apparent, for example, from the Mid-Year 1952 Economic Review prepared by the Council of Economic Advisers to the President of the United States. This review discloses the continuous growth in the capitalist countries of armies of unemployed and semi-unemployed, an increase which is to some extent reduced by the fact that people are being transferred to war industries, to production for purposes of war.

85. The economic and financial situation in the western European countries is deteriorating. The deficit in the balance of payments of these countries is growing alarmingly. In the United Kingdom, for example, the reserves of currency at the end of the first half of 1952 had gone down to less than half of what they were the year before.

86. It is therefore no coincidence that Mr. Draper, the United States representative in the Council of the North Atlantic bloc, notes in his report that Western Europe is concerned at the financial and payments situation, particularly the dollar shortage, which results from the excess of American exports over imports and which places the countries of western Europe in a difficult situation. “There is real danger”, the report says, “of a deep and perhaps disastrous fissure between the economies of Europe and America”.

87. In this connexion it should be observed that the well-known Marshall plan played a considerable part in dislocating the economies of the Western European countries. It has now been replaced by plans in which the aggressive character of United States policy appears still more clearly, such as the United States mutual security programme, the Schumann plan and the Pleven plan. The same thing must also be said about so-called American economic assistance under Point Four of the Truman programme. All these plans and measures are calculated to make the economies of the Western European countries and other countries subservient to the military and strategic plans of the aggressive North Atlantic bloc; as was demonstrated long ago, they are directed against the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China and the European peoples' democracies. When dictating their will to these countries, the ruling circles of the United States attempt to cover up these plans by stressing the so-called problem of strengthening defence in the so-called free

countries against the Soviet Union, which is alleged to be planning an attack on the United States, the United Kingdom, France and the other States which are members of that bloc.

88. But this so-called assistance places even such economically developed countries as the United Kingdom and France in a difficult position. In his message to Congress of 9 January 1952, Mr. Truman was compelled to admit that the so-called "defense build-up" in the "free" countries (by "free" countries is meant principally all countries which are members of the North Atlantic bloc) had created severe economic problems". Those are the words of Mr. Truman, President of the United States. To quote Mr. Truman again, this "build-up" "has increased inflation in Europe and has endangered the continued recovery of our allies". These words, I think, are not without significance.

89. In such circumstances, what can be said of the situation in the under-developed countries, which literally writhe under this "assistance" under the Truman programme, and which are subjected to open looting and the most shameless exploitation on the part of the United States and other colonial Powers, countries where the United States is carrying out the task of so-called guidance, placed upon it, according to Mr. Truman, by Providence itself?

90. The aggressive foreign policy of the ruling circles of the United States is reflected in the conduct within the United Nations of the representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom, France and certain other States which belong to the North Atlantic bloc.

91. To turn to the work of the Disarmament Commission, organized at the sixth session of the General Assembly [*resolution 502 (VI)*], there can be no doubt that the majority of the members of that Commission, headed by the United States, have directed all their efforts to preventing any real disarmament and any reduction of armaments, and to preventing the prohibition of atomic weapons, and instead have done all they can to legalize the further growth of armaments and give the United States the opportunity to continue accumulating stock piles of atomic bombs. It is indeed impossible to take seriously, as measures for the reduction of armaments and the prohibition of atomic weapons, the proposals of this Anglo-American group for what they call a progressive disclosure and verification of armaments and armed forces in the famous five stages; these proposals are obviously calculated to delay the adoption of any decisions which might be even to the smallest degree effective, and truly designed to bring about a reduction of armaments and the prohibition of atomic weapons. Nor is it possible to take seriously the proposal of the United States, the United Kingdom and France, that numerical limits should be set on the armed forces of the various States, without anything being done to establish the relations between the air, naval and land forces; for the determination of such relations is an important element in any plan which is really calculated to bring about a reduction of armaments.

92. We shall have occasion to revert to the work of the Disarmament Commission later, when the report of the Commission is considered. For the time being we shall say no more. It may also be recalled that the so-called Disarmament Commission has completely evaded

the outstandingly important question of the prohibition of atomic weapons. The Commission refused also to consider the proposal of the Soviet Union delegation that States which had not acceded to or ratified the Geneva Protocol, forbidding the use of bacterial weapons should be called upon to do so.

93. Speaking of the work of the Disarmament Commission, Mr. Acheson said: "We will not commit aggression with atomic bombs or any other kinds of bombs. We will not commit aggression with chemical weapons or bacterial weapons . . ." [*380th meeting*].

94. If the United States is really prepared to refrain from the use of atomic bombs or any other kinds of bombs, why does it persist year after year in rejecting the USSR proposals for the immediate and unconditional prohibition of atomic weapons? Why does it refuse even to make a statement on this subject? If the United States is really prepared to refrain from the use of chemical or bacterial weapons, why does Mr. Acheson systematically and stubbornly refuse to ratify the Geneva Protocol of 1925 on the prohibition of the use of bacterial weapons? It would appear that the United States is the only country in the world of any importance which has not ratified this 1925 Protocol on the prohibition of the use of bacterial weapons. How is it possible to believe statements that the United States will not resort to aggression with atomic bombs or with chemical weapons or bacterial weapons, as stated by Mr. Acheson the day before yesterday, when at the same time it rejects proposals for the unconditional prohibition of atomic weapons and stubbornly refuses to ratify the Protocol on the prohibition of the use of bacterial weapons? If the United States is really prepared to agree to a substantial reduction of armaments and armed forces, why does it systematically reject proposals for the reduction of armaments, and why does it instead, before the eyes of the whole world, engage in frantic armaments production and feverishly keep on building new military bases on foreign territories for use against the USSR, the People's Republic of China and the European peoples' democracies?

95. Let us compare words and deeds. You now have the opportunity to assess the significance and value of these words in the light of actual facts, that is, of the intensive militarization which the United States is carrying out at home, while at the same time goading, whipping and spurring on the nations which are friendly to it in the same direction.

96. Mr. Acheson affirmed that, in the Disarmament Commission, the United States had "sought to outline a comprehensive disarmament programme with a view to reducing the possibility and the fear of war". In reality however, the whole work of the representatives of the United States—with which Mr. Acheson must be fairly well acquainted—as well as the work of the representatives of a number of other governments which support the United States in the Disarmament Commission, was not only not directed towards the preparation of a "comprehensive disarmament programme", but was not even calculated to bring about a small real reduction of armaments and armed forces. All the Commission's proposals amounted to nothing but the already familiar listing of armaments, submitted, moreover, in accordance with the famous system of stages. The Commission merely indulged in insignificant conversations on the establishment of levels of armaments,



which in the last resort were left to the discretion of each individual country. Look at the records of the Commission and you will realize that there is not a single incorrect word in this appraisal.

97. That is how the matter stands with the work of the Disarmament Commission. Clearly the United States, and also the United Kingdom, France and a number of other countries which are members of the Disarmament Commission, are not interested in really effective work by the Commission, or in a real reduction of armaments or the prohibition of atomic weapons.

98. As for the work of the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council, it is impossible not to observe that the whole of that work has been along the lines of the aggressive foreign policy of the United States. Taking advantage of the governments which are obedient to it, which are members of the North Atlantic bloc or which support that bloc, the United States has at preceding sessions carried through the United Nations a whole series of decisions which obviously violate the principles of the Charter of the United Nations while at the same time weakening the United Nations and placing it in a position of absolute dependence on United States policy. Such are the decisions relating to the so-called "Uniting for peace" [resolution 377 (V)], the organization of the so-called Collective Measures Committee [resolution 377 (V)], and the shameful decisions declaring the People's Republic of China to be an aggressor and approving the United States intervention in Korea. All this proves that the Anglo-American bloc has no regard for the Charter and does not consider itself bound by the obligations imposed by the Charter.

99. The United States seeks to make use of the United Nations for its own aggressive purposes; therefore, like the ruling circles of a number of other countries which support it, it is attempting to prevent a genuine representative of the great Chinese people from taking part in the work of the United Nations. This line of action flagrantly violates the principles of the United Nations, and no government can subscribe to it if it regards the United Nations as an organization for international co-operation, which it should be if the Charter is properly respected and observed. The People's Republic of China should have its representative in the United Nations if the United Nations has any regard for its name and authority.

100. In their plan for the preparation of a new world war, the ruling circles of the United States, supported by the United Kingdom and France, place considerable—though, it can be said in advance, vain—hopes on the organization of subversive activities, espionage and terrorism against the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China and the European peoples' democracies. As a result of support by a number of countries which are Members of the United Nations, the United States laws of 10 October 1951 and 20 June 1952 on the organization of these criminal activities still remain in force. Such a situation is intolerable.

101. At this session, the Soviet Union Government will try to ensure that the United Nations, which can be a means of strengthening peace and international co-operation, adopts on this matter a position in accordance with its principles, purposes and functions; this means that the United Nations must seek to prevent

the realization of plans for undermining peace and increasing the threat of a new world war.

102. The Soviet Union attaches great importance to the United Nations and its part in the struggle for peace and international security. The USSR delegation is well aware of the difficulties with which it has and will have to contend in this struggle, in its defence, in the United Nations, of the cause of peace, in its attempt to ensure the cessation of hostilities where they are now taking place, in its attempt to secure the adoption of proposals designed to avert a new world war, to preserve peace and to put an end to the fighting where it is going on. At this session, the delegation of the Soviet Union will not hesitate before any difficulties to achieve the most effective and successful results in the struggle to avert the threat of another world war and to strengthen peace.

103. In 1949, at the fourth session of the General Assembly, the Soviet Union, in pursuit of its policy for the strengthening of peace and co-operation among all nations desirous of such co-operation and taking into consideration the mobilization of the forces of aggression which, at that time, was becoming more intensive, raised its voice against the preparation of another world war and in defence of peace and the security of the nations. The USSR delegation proposed that the General Assembly should call upon all States to settle their disputes and disagreements by peaceful means, without resorting to force or the threat of force, and that they should conclude among themselves a pact for the strengthening of peace [A/996]. In this proposal, the delegation of the Soviet Union reflected the unswerving will and resolve of the peoples to avert the threat of a new war and guarantee the preservation of peace, a determination which found expression in the powerful popular movement in all countries in favour of peace and against the instigators of war. Unlike the North Atlantic Treaty, which is not an agreement based on the principle of respect for the sovereign equality of the parties, but was dictated by the United States, the five-Power peace pact must be an agreement based on the principle of equality in the relations among the parties, an agreement which genuinely pursues the aim of strengthening peace and of combatting aggression in whatever guise it may threaten the peace-loving peoples. The five-Power pact must guarantee a genuinely peaceful policy on the part of these Powers, in contrast to the North Atlantic Treaty, which is undermined by fundamental internal contradictions and is based upon an erroneous premise—the negation of the sovereignty of States; its very basis is therefore unsound.

104. The Soviet Union continued its campaign for a peace pact at the fifth and sixth sessions of the General Assembly. The conclusion of a five-Power peace pact is even more important at the present time, when the North Atlantic bloc has intensified its activities in preparation for a new world war. The conclusion of such a pact cannot fail to upset the war-like plans of the aggressive circles of the United States, the United Kingdom and certain other countries, and must necessarily arrest all attempts to launch another world war.

105. The lessons of the war in Korea cannot and must not pass unheeded. The war in Korea has shown the losses the peoples will sustain—and the American people will be no exception—if the United States

war-mongers launch a world war in their own predatory interests.

106. At the present session also, the USSR Government considers it its duty to do all it can to persuade the General Assembly to appeal to the five great Powers to conclude a peace pact, which would correspond to the vital interests of all peoples.

107. The USSR delegation will give every possible support to the proposals for the conclusion of a peace pact submitted by the Polish delegation at this session, for the reduction of the armed forces of the great powers by one-third, for the elimination of the threat of war and the strengthening of peace.

108. The Soviet Union has given concrete evidence of its desire for peace, of its willingness for a peaceful settlement of important questions of international relations which are still outstanding. But let no one abuse the Soviet people's desire for peace. Let no one neglect the lessons of history—of the history of Russia and the history of the Soviet State, which on more than one occasion has emerged victorious from the tribulations of a war forced upon it by aggressors.

109. I am concluding, Mr. President, but before doing so, I should like to say a few words about the statement made by the Swedish Foreign Minister, Mr. Uden [379th meeting], concerning the violation by a Swedish Catalina military aircraft of the Soviet frontier, a matter which has already been exhausted by an exchange of notes between the Swedish and USSR Governments.

110. In his statement, Mr. Uden dealt with a whole string of problems—the problem of the high seas, of territorial waters, frontier belts, international zones and arbitration. As regards the question of the Swedish aircraft, the published USSR notes indicate that on 16 June 1952, Soviet aircraft gave chase to a Swedish Catalina military aircraft which had violated our frontiers. The published notes state that it is the sacred duty of every State to protect its frontiers. It also goes without saying that the responsibility for violations of the frontiers of another State must always rest and does rest with those who perpetrate such violations.

111. As we know, the foreign policy of every State is an extension of its domestic policy. From the very first days of the formation of the Soviet State, the USSR Government has waged an unrelenting struggle for peace, for the development of friendly relations with other States on the basis of respect for the principles of equal rights and independence and has defended the interests of the Soviet people, which are identical with the fundamental interests of the peoples of all other countries. In so doing, the Government of the Soviet Union has been and is at present guided by the principles laid down by the head of the Government, I. V. Stalin, namely that "the basis of our Government's policy, its foreign policy, is the concept of peace" and that the task of USSR foreign policy is "the struggle for peace, the struggle against new wars and the exposure of all measures being undertaken with a view to the preparation of a new war".

112. In accordance with these high principles, the Government of the Soviet Union seeking to ensure the maintenance of lasting peace, has often, over a

long period of time, taken the initiative in approaching other States with proposals for the strengthening of collective security, has invariably raised its voice against aggression and in defence of peoples which have fallen victim to the aggressive policy of imperialist States, and of countries which are fighting for their national independence.

113. During the Second World War, the Soviet Union acted as one of the sponsors of the creation of the United Nations, in the hope that this new Organization would become genuinely international, that it would profit by the mistakes of the League of Nations to become a pledge of lasting peace, and that it would succeed in averting the threat of a new world war and in protecting mankind against the disasters of further carnage.

114. In pursuance of its policy of peace, the USSR has upheld the need for general disarmament or the reduction of armaments. Throughout three decades, from 1922 to the present day, it has put forward proposals on those lines at international conferences and has persistently sought to secure the adoption of decisions which would ensure an effective reduction of armaments and armed forces, the elimination of the threat of a new war and the preservation of peace.

115. The Soviet Union's policy was and is based on a recognition of the possibility of the co-existence of the communist and capitalist systems and of co-operation between the Soviet Union and the capitalist countries and all other countries wanting such co-operation.

116. Throughout the almost thirty-five years of its existence, the Soviet State has often demonstrated its unwavering desire for the establishment and strengthening of peaceful relations with the capitalist countries.

117. As long ago as 1920, our great teacher and leader, Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, described the foreign policy of the Soviet States as follows: "We have waged a struggle for peace with unsurpassed energy. Such a struggle gives magnificent results . . .". The struggle for peace is the keynote of USSR foreign policy.

118. In 1934, our leader and teacher, the great Stalin, made the following exhaustive definition of Soviet Union policy: "Our foreign policy is clear. It is a policy of preserving peace and strengthening trade relations with all countries. The USSR does not propose to threaten, much less to attack anyone. We stand for peace and defend the cause of peace. But we do not fear threats and are ready to answer the war-mongers blow for blow . . .".

119. The Soviet Union has remained and will remain unswervingly loyal to these noble principles of its peaceful foreign policy. I would remind you that in April 1952, in reply to the direct question: "On what basis is the co-existence of capitalism and communism possible?", which was put to him by a group of American journalists, the Prime Minister of the USSR, I. V. Stalin, gave the following answer: "The peaceful co-existence of capitalism and communism is perfectly possible provided that there is a mutual desire to co-operate and a readiness to carry out the obligations assumed, and provided that the principles of equality and of non-intervention in the internal domestic affairs of other States are observed".

120. The Soviet State's struggle for peace has been characterized by new methods, which differ essentially from the methods of the countries of monopolistic capitalism. The latter countries, with the United States in the lead, and the United Kingdom and France limping in the rear, base their foreign policy on the idea of "deterrent force", which Mr. Truman and General Eisenhower, Mr. Acheson and Mr. Dulles laud to the skies. The USSR is fighting for peace by its own methods, which are based on the principle of respect for the independence and sovereign equality of States, mutual support and effective, disinterested, mutual help in attaining further successes in strengthening new peaceful, democratic and socialist régimes, in genuine and honest peaceful co-operation, in the joint defence of the interests of their countries and peoples, interests inseparable from those of all peace-loving countries and peoples. The peaceful foreign policy of the Soviet Union rests upon the peaceful creative toil of the Soviet people, who are building a new society. It is a logical consequence of the principles upon which the socialist régime is based.

121. The policy of the USSR is a policy of peaceful and creative labour. This policy is governed by the basic economic law of socialism, whose main features and requirements were defined by Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin in the following terms: "To secure the maximum satisfaction of the constantly growing material and cultural requirements of society as a whole through the uninterrupted development and perfecting of socialist production on the basis of the most advanced technical methods".

122. The new five-year plan of development for the Soviet Union has been drawn up in accordance with this law and constitutes an impressive programme of peaceful, economic and cultural construction. It provides for a further powerful upsurge of the national economy and ensures a further substantial rise in the material well-being and cultural level of the Soviet people. It is designed to promote the expansion and consolidation of economic co-operation between the Soviet Union and the people's democracies and to contribute to the development of economic relations with all countries wishing to develop trade with the USSR on a basis of equality and mutual advantage. The fifth five-year plan provides new and exceptionally cogent evidence of the peaceful aspirations and aims of USSR foreign policy. It is a striking refutation of the slanderous and trumped-up allegations to the effect that the USSR is developing a war industry, is engaged in an arms race and has some kind of war-like designs. It envisages the peaceful development of the Soviet Union economy and completely corresponds to the Soviet people's unanimous desire to defend the cause of peace and thus to secure all the conditions required for the fulfilment of the gigantic tasks confronting them.

123. The USSR delegation urgently appeals to the General Assembly to support the peace proposals of the Polish delegation. It is the General Assembly's duty to adopt these proposals, which are worthy of a truly international organization, an organization which corresponds to the vital interests of all peoples and which is called upon to defend peace and international security, to remove the impending threat of a new world war and to avert the immense disasters

and sufferings which would be the peoples' lot should they again be drawn into the maelstrom of such a war.

124. 'Mr. OCAMPOS (Paraguay) (*translated from Spanish*): It is hardly possible to take part in this opening debate of the seventh session of the General Assembly without referring first of all to the armed conflict which has engaged the attention of the whole world since 25 June 1950. Since that sad and fateful day, there have been two sessions of the General Assembly of the Organization which was created at San Francisco, and the third one is now beginning. But the conflict still goes on, claiming thousands of victims, destroying homes and engulfing vast material wealth. It was thought that the good sense of the Powers which fought the war against the Axis would suffice to create a world with more security and less fear. But Korea in flames belies this hope and mankind is more than ever a prey to fear.

125. We must not allow the routine of these international assemblies, with their inevitable ceremony and their still more inevitable flood of speeches, to banish or weaken our understanding of the real meaning of this tragedy. The war in Korea goes on. We must return again and again to this simple and terrible fact and ponder its challenge to the conscience of our civilization and to the principles set forth in the Charter.

126. The United Nations did its best to meet its responsibilities in this emergency. The aggression was recognized and condemned by the competent organs of the United Nations and, although the concurrence of one of the permanent members of the Security Council was lacking throughout, the machinery for collective action was put into operation to repel the attack and to re-establish peace and security in the troubled area. An overwhelming majority of nations, both great and small, gave both moral and material assistance, as far as they were able within the limits of their capacities, their means and their resources, to the action undertaken by the Security Council. It is true that it has not been possible to achieve our purposes fully, but there have been definite results of practical value and of supreme moral value. In the first place, the United Nations has almost unanimously condemned the aggression; secondly, a great many of its Members are giving effective material assistance; thirdly, the system of collective security has been put to the test for the first time and the world now knows what action to take in similar cases.

127. When the permanent representative of the USSR made his statement of 23 June 1951 in New York, millions of people believed that peace was in sight in Korea and that an armistice would be possible. Nevertheless, the negotiations at Panmunjon have gone on for more than a year and there has been no end to the conflict. For several months, now, the question of the exchange of prisoners of war has been the root cause of an apparently insuperable deadlock. Yet the delegation of Paraguay still believes that it is possible to find a compromise formula which will take into account the legal, human and moral aspects of the problem. As regards the second aspect, Paraguay recognizes the justice of the principle that the wishes of prisoners who do not want to be repatriated should be respected, for that principle is based on natural law. The world is entitled to hope that, by the acceptance of this principle,



the final obstacle will be removed and that we shall be able to achieve an honourable armistice; the United Nations has already made as many concessions as it can to that end without abandoning its principles. The end of the Korean war would lead to a rapid relaxation of international tension and to the creation of an atmosphere far more favourable to progress and the solution of the most important problems affecting world peace than that prevailing at present.

128. The Collective Measures Committee, which was set up by the Assembly at its fifth session under the "Uniting for peace" resolution [377 (V)], is to submit its second report to us at this seventh session.

129. This resolution resulted from the fear that the veto might be used in a case of aggression, and from the lack of unanimity among the permanent members of the Security Council regarding the negotiation of the special agreements referred to in Article 43 of the Charter. Accordingly, the resolution extended the powers of the General Assembly in the event—and only in the event—that the Security Council should find itself prevented by the use of the veto from exercising its "primary responsibility" under Article 24. Naturally it is to be hoped that these two circumstances will change, that, in the first place, there will be a decrease in the danger of the use of the veto in connexion with an act of aggression, and, secondly, that there will be at least a minimum agreement among the permanent members of the Security Council to enable them to negotiate the agreements designed to implement, under the Council's auspices, the system of collective security provided for in the Charter. Until these two requirements are met—and the delegation of Paraguay is convinced that the United Nations should work towards that end—the General Assembly is entitled to consider that the Security Council's "primary responsibility" is not its exclusive responsibility, and consequently does not relieve the Assembly of the obligation to fill the gap which, if allowed to exist, might at any moment plunge the world into international anarchy or war. It is in the light of these considerations that the delegation of Paraguay will examine the second report of the Collective Measures Committee [A/2215].

130. Paraguay sincerely regrets the fact that the Disarmament Commission set up by a resolution [502 (VI)] of the General Assembly has not made any progress in bringing the gap between the opposing views on certain basic questions, which was already apparent in previous years in the Commission for Conventional Armaments and the Atomic Energy Commission.

131. Rearmament imposes a heavy burden, not only on the great Powers but on all the countries of the world, for it produces instability in international trade and finance, which has serious economic repercussions everywhere. Consequently it is quite rightly a matter of universal concern that the great Powers should agree on the general outline of a balanced plan for disarmament. The delegation of Paraguay still considers that the afore-mentioned resolution constitutes a fair basis for the progress of discussion on these questions. At the same time, there can be no doubt that the international tension, aggravated by the Korean war and the long-drawn-out armistice negotiations, is the least favourable atmosphere for a conciliation of the differing or opposing viewpoints expressed in the Disarma-

ment Commission. The ending of the Korean war is therefore essential if the Commission's work is to succeed and the world is to be freed from the terrible economic and moral consequences of the armaments race.

132. The problem of the admission to the Organization of countries which have applied for membership continues year after year to challenge the United Nations. Paraguay regrets that the lack of basic agreement among the great Powers on this subject has kept out of the Organization countries with such high qualifications for admission as Italy, a country which we take the liberty of mentioning particularly because of its supremely important position in the community of peace-loving and democratic nations of the world. We believe that the United Nations should adhere closely to the principle laid down in the Charter that all nations that are peace-loving and presumed to be such are entitled to be admitted as Members of the Organization. It should be the policy of the United Nations, on the basis of this very wise principle, to try to make its membership as universal as possible, for that would increase the possibilities of international co-operation and advance the cause of peace. The opposite attitude would serve only to foster resentment among the nations whose admission was unjustly delayed and would increase instead of decreasing the causes of international friction.

133. Poverty, sickness and ignorance are at present the scourges of many countries and vast regions of the globe, and nearly two-thirds of the human race suffer the consequences of these evils. It may be said that such conditions constitute a type of aggression within each country which is as dangerous as armed aggression on the international level. In the countries where they prevail, they create an atmosphere of discontent, social insecurity and political instability. In such an atmosphere it is easy for extremes of scepticism and despair to flourish. In a world in which peoples are becoming more and more interdependent, such a situation is in itself a threat to international peace and security.

134. The delegation of Paraguay fully agrees with the view expressed by the Secretary-General, in the introduction to his annual report that it is essential for the "countries whose peoples enjoy high standards of living . . . to join more fully in aiding the economic development of the under-developed countries". As the Secretary-General points out, and expanded international programme of this kind would not be "an act of charity", but on the contrary would constitute "a sound investment in peace and stability and lead to a mutually beneficial expansion of world productivity and world trade".<sup>4</sup>

135. The delegation of Paraguay is convinced that the intensification of the efforts which the United Nations is making to provide technical assistance for the under-developed countries and to give them better economic opportunities is one of the most positive contributions which the United Nations could make towards peace and international co-operation. Consequently we believe that, in spite of the unfavourable conditions created by rearmament, the General Assembly should go forward with, rather than interrupt, the activities in respect of economic development and technical as-

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, Seventh Session, Supplement No. 1A, p. 4.

sistance which it initiated in previous years. The faith of the peoples in the United Nations depends largely upon an understanding of this necessity.

136. The delegation of Paraguay hopes and trusts that the Assembly will take steps at this session which will strengthen this faith and increase the prestige of the Organization.

137. Mr. GUIZADO (Panama) (*translated from Spanish*): Panama, its people and its Government, which I have the honour to represent here, comes to this seventh session with a message of brotherhood to the governments and peoples which compose this Organization. My country once again reaffirms its ever-growing faith in the fruitful efforts of the Assembly, which will certainly help to strengthen universal peace.

138. Panama has followed with intense interest the great work of the United Nations. We know that the United Nations is working not only to banish the danger of conflicts and the threat of war but—and this is perhaps more important—that it is also adopting measures to help countries where health, education and the economy are backward, that it is leading them to security and prosperity. In this way the danger of war is lessened and at the same time these countries are helped to make a constructive contribution to international harmony.

139. We realize that wars result from actions which are sometimes illogical and contrary to political factors which are already stable; at a given moment, these actions come into conflict with motives which are incompatible with them, thus upsetting the balance on which peace is based. One of the potential causes of disturbances is the social conflict, for it affects a part of mankind which is at a disadvantage as regards purchasing power.

140. Panama, like the other countries of the American continent, is an ardent believer in the work of the United Nations in this important field. We in America can never say too often how particularly sympathetic we are to this aspect of the work of the United Nations.

We are young countries, often under-developed, with requirements in the technical, particularly the economic, and also the social fields and we have very urgent problems which must be solved if we are to abolish anxiety, uncertainty and dangerous unrest.

141. My country is also particularly interested in the problem of the admission of new Members. Various methods have been considered at previous sessions of the Assembly and important decisions have been reached on this subject, but it seems that one point has not been given sufficient attention, namely, that it is the United Nations more than anyone else which stands to benefit by making it possible for all peoples and governments to become Members of the Organization. The United Nations should always keep its doors wide open to all countries which pursue the same ideals and are prepared to uphold its principles. The real justification for the existence of the United Nations is that it should be an association of all the peoples and governments of the world, confident that their closer relationship and the mutual understanding of one another's problems will tend to dispel dangerous antagonisms and to establish a real atmosphere of harmony. Panama is most anxious to co-operate in the solution of these weighty problems.

142. My delegation has come to this session imbued with the most ardent faith in the work which is to be done. We are here united in the defence of a great cause, in the struggle for a noble ideal, in the attempt to keep aloft the greatest and the most sublime principle of human relations, that of peace with freedom. In these dramatic moments of history, we know that our labours are not in vain. Therefore, in expressing our good wishes for the success of this session of the Assembly, we wish to emphasize that, in our opinion, the effective and loyal co-operation of each Member in the solution of the serious problems now before the world will be a most effective contribution towards victory in the struggle against aggression and the maintenance of lasting peace.

*The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.*